REMARKS

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Caputo et al.(Caputo).

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended at line 35 to recite that the card adhesion to the base is such that it permits "removal". Support for this amendment is found in the specification at page 10, line 10.

Fischer, the primary reference, discloses a specific form that has a detachable card element held in place with an adhesive which is a part of an adhesive system that transfers the adhesive from the element to which it is applied to the card. In Fischer, all of the surface was provided with an adhesive because the surface of the element to which the adhesive was originally applied was treated according to col. 3, lines 27-31 of Fischer.

Fischer relied upon a peelable adhesive that is transferred to the card as the card is removed. Since the peelable adhesive is transferred to and stays on the back of removable card, it causes the removed card to stick to other cards which is a distinct disadvantage.

The claims of the present application, as amended, point out a business form with a detachable card where the adhesion of the card to the business form is controlled by a pattern of (a) selective variable adhesion that is achieved by the use of alternating areas of easy and tight separation by a method comprising a corona, flame or plasma treatment of a surface. In the method defined by amended claim 1 of the present application, the pattern is based on a combination of treated and untreated areas that facilitate the removal of the card without the need to use a peelable adhesive because the adhesive properties of the surface have been modified. The selective adhesion imparted by the pattern, as defined in claim 1, is achieved by creating a surface where certain areas

have no treatment and thus no enhanced adhesion as well as other areas which are treated to provide sufficient enhanced adhesion so that the card will not fall off the form prior to when it is desired to remove the card from the surface of the form.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Fischer patent that makes it obvious to provide less than ***all of the surface of the layer*** to which the card is to be adhered with adhesive, This is evident from the Fischer method which requires that a peelable adhesive be used which must be removed with the card (col. 5, lines 12-15). Fischer does not teach a method of surface treatment and fail to make obvious the use of corona, flame or plasma treatment method as recited in claim 1.

Caputo has been cited as disclosing a resealable label flap where a selected zone of ***a surface*** has been "corona treated (differentially treated)". The concept of differential treatment that provides alternating areas of easy and tight separation that extend under a card area defined by a diecut, as recited in claim 1, is not disclosed by Caputo.

It is apparent that Caputo is concerned with increasing adhesion under all of the area 20 that is to be contacted with a tab edge 18 to make tab edge 18 unremovable by treating all of the surface to provide a tightly bonded edge 18 in order to make the tab18 unremovable. If the Caputo teaching of corona treatment is applied to the Fisher peelable adhesive location, Fisher would be rendered inoperative as the degree of adhesion would be increased. Claim 1 has been amended to point that the claimed structure has a removable piece that is removable as disclosed in the specification at page 8, lines 18-20. This recitation makes it clear that coupon or label is removable even though a pattern of a treated area is applied under a removable coupon or label. Caputo applies a corona treatment to all of the surface of the area that is contacted with the adhesive. This non-selective corona treatment does not suggest the making of a pattern of treated and untreated areas to a diecut piece as recited in

claim 1 and the claims that are dependent on claim 1.

Since there is no reason to combine Fisher and Caputo together other that the applicants' specification and even when these references are consider alone or in combination, they fail to make the amended claims obvious.

The text of claim 1 recites that a "***patterned treated area***" is placed on the surface of thin film layer (iv) which as selective variable adhesion. Caputo treats the part of the surface of the snack food bag to which the flap of a resealable label flap is attached. The area is ***completely treated*** **and the concept of selective treatment is not even remotely suggested.** The Caputo method treats all of the area under the flap so that the flap cannot be easily removed as recited in amended claim 1. No pattern is formed that extends under a card area or any area that would correspond to the card area of claim 1.

The Caputo patent is directed to the art of resealable label flaps where a pressure sensitive adhesive is placed on the surface of the removable seal so that the removable seal may be *repositioned* on the surface of the container. Caputo applies an unpatterned corona treatment only in the area that is positioned under the label flap for the purpose of increasing the adhesive anchoring characteristics under all of the area contacted by the label flap portion 18 of label flap 14. (col. 2, line 45-55). This area is not formed in a pattern of selective variable adhesion of "alternating easy and tight strength". The Caputo concept is to provide in the corona treated zone, the same level of adhesion, without any pattern, as defined in claim 1 of the present application.

The Caputo patent does not teach how to make a removable card intermediate as it is limited to making resealable bags. One skilled in the art would never consider resealable bags as a source or inspiration for information as to how to make a card intermediate.

The text of claim 1 recites that the alternating ***areas*** of easy and tight separation that extend under the card area

defined by the diecut, This recitation points out a concept that is not made obvious by Caputo's use of a zone of undifferentiated or non-patterned corona treatment at the point where the resealable flap is to be positioned.

The Caputo flap element 18 is never intended to be removed during the life of the Caputo bag as that would defeat the reason for enhancing the bond strength of the flap. The use of a pattern of differential adhesion under the flap of the Caputo bag is directly contrary to the teachings of Caputo.

The Examiner has stated that since Caputo relates to the control of adhesive effects and Fischer teaches that different adhesive effects can be achieved through suitable process control. Claim 1 does not use process controls to control adhesion; the use of discrete areas having different adhesion are not suggested by any method of controlling the overall adhesion of a continuous peelable layer. The references are not properly combinable based on the teachings found in the references. The Caputo patent has been applied for the limited purpose of its teaching of the corona treatment method of modifying adhesion which does not make obvious the differential pattern as defined in amended claim 1. The differential method of Caputo is to completely treat the area where the flap is to be anchored as no other treatment is applied at that location. The language of claim 1 of the present application requires a patterned treated area to be formed that extends under the area defined by the diecut. Thus, Caputo's "differential treatment" is concentrated at one location for the purpose of providing a permanent anchorage for the flap 14. There is not the slightest suggestion that a pattern of ***variable adhesion*** is to be formed under an area where a card is adhesively positioned in order to make the card removable

For these reasons, it is requested that the amended claims be favorably considered.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989